DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 280 161 EA 019 270

AUTHOR Nelson, David; And Others
TITLE Implications of the Texas Mandate for Comprehensive Performance Appraisal.
PUB DATE 26 Oct 86
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Society for Educational Planning (Washington, DC, October 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Ladders; *Competency Based Teacher Education; *Educational Change; Educational Legislation; Elementary Secondary Education; Incentives; Instruction; Instructional Improvement; Job Training; Merit Pay; *Personnel Evaluation; State Legislation; *Teacher Education; Teaching Experience
IDENTIFIERS *Texas

ABSTRACT

This paper: (1) describes the recently implemented Texas plan for school reform; (2) delineates a major component of Texas reform, the career ladder. In response to a nationwide call for raised educational standards, Texas passed HB 72, a comprehensive education bill implementing a comprehensive "career ladder" model for the testing, certification, placement, and evaluation of all teachers in the state. The career ladder concept has three components: competency testing, merit pay, and performance appraisal. It is anticipated that teachers will demonstrate a knowledge of basic skills, a knowledge of subject matter, and a knowledge of pedagogy, and so experience a heightened sense of professionalism. According to HB 72, teachers are assigned to a career level based on criteria that require an objective checking system: experience, job-related education, advanced academic training, and job assignment. Performance appraisal is conducted in the classroom by a trained evaluator. The quality of teachers' performance is determined, and each teacher is placed at a career ladder level (level 2, 3, or 4), with financial incentives for each higher level. Mandated and planned changes in the induction and licensure of teachers and administrators in various states are examined. Concluding the paper are 18 references and three tables. (WTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED280161

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David Nelson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IMPLICATIONS OF THE TEXAS MANDATE FOR COMPREHENSIVE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

A Symposium Presented

at the

International Society of Educational Planning

Washington, D.C.

October 26, 1986

David Nelson

Geraldine Roberts

Wesley Sandness

Pittsburg State University

EA 019 270

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IMPLICATIONS OF THE TEXAS MANDATE FOR COMPREHENSIVE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

David Nelson
Geraldine Roberts
Wesley Sandness

Early in January, B.C. 49, when the Roman Senate, amid great uproar, decreed that Caesar disband his army or be considered a public enemy, he failed to do so. With vigor and dispatch characteristic of his previous military operations, Caesar at once crossed the Rubicon, the southern boundary of his province (Peck, 1965). The Rubicon, a small river in Italy, flows into the Adriatic and is celebrated in history because of Caesar's passage through it at the head of his army and consequent declaration of war against the Senate. The term "crossing the Rubicon" has come to denote a course of action from which there is no turning back.

Due to the outcry about the perceived incompetence of some public teachers, Texas crossed its Rubicon when the 67th Legislature in 1981, mandated testing for admission to teacher education programs and for final certification for graduates. This step constitutes an initial effort to improve the quality of teaching in the public schools of Texas, and reflects one aspect of a national trend toward educational reform. Since 1981, Texas, a "bellwether" state in educational reform, has led the nation in planning and implementing competency testing for teachers and administrators, teacher induction, and career ladders.

Such steps constitute a major effort to improve the quality of teaching in the public schools in Texas and reflect a national trend that is being replayed as states respond to the national reports, studies, and recommendations.

Reports, such as those formulated by the Commission on Exellence, the Boyer Report, the Carnegie Forum, and the Holmes Group, must be taken seriously by educational planners for they are taken seriously by the general public. Thus, as more and more states cross the Rubicon, a basic question remains: Will competency testing, career ladders, and performance appraisal cure the major ills of education? By carefully examining the Texas model and the events surrounding it, educational planners stand to gain a wealth of information about the legislated response to educational reform.

Many of the reports cited above severely criticize the quality of teaching in the public schools as woefully inadequate and impugn the preparation of teachers as structurally flawed. Among a series of recommendations to correct the poor condition of the profession, the various reports suggest higher academic standards for teacher candidates, competitive salaries based on merit, eleven month teacher contracts, grant and loan incentives to attract better teachers, and a career ladder leading to the status of master teacher (Williams, 1983). The cost of these improvements is being borne by already overburdened state and local governments.

To disregard public and professional discontent with perceived incompetence of teachers and administrators, however, would indeed be a refusal to acknowledge reality. Dealing with such issues and the professional costs implicit in their implementation may well be one of the most challenging problems the professional community has ever encountered. Therefore, in the search for a fundamental method of providing assurance for professional competence, the general consensus has been that testing teachers before they are certified to teach in public schools and evaluating teachers after they have attained initial certification could provide a solution. The purpose of this paper is: (1) to describe the recently implemented Texas plan for school reform, (2) to delineate a major component of Texas reform, the career ladder and, related, performance appraisal, and (3) to examine the status of planned and mandated change in the induction and licensure of teachers and administrators in various states.

Background

Testing and evaluating for competence is neither an original idea nor a novel concept; testing and evaluation have been in existence since the colonial period, when much variation existed in the preparation of those who sought to teach in the private and public schools of the time (Stinnett, Hugett, 1963). The recent trend of education reform has reintroduced the use of minimum competency and

licensure examinations. A growing use of such examinations was initially reported in 1967, especially in the use of the National Teacher Examination (NTE), and the Graduate Record Examination (GRE). Six states then used the NTE as a prerequisite for one or more types of certificates. Nine states used proficiency examinations in lieu of credit in some courses. Many of the largest school systems used examinations, typically the NTE, either as a prerequisite to certification, where the state had legal authority to certify its teachers or to become eligible for appointments to positions (Kidd, 1984). Until 1975, Texas, for example, required that graduates of teacher education programs in the state take the NTE. The major reasons for discontinuing the policy were that no state cutting scores on the NTE were established or required, and the results were seldom used by the public schools. By 1986, however, approximately two-thirds of the 50 states required new teachers to pass a basic skills test before teaching in public school classrooms (Solorazans, 1986).

The authority of states to legislate teacher testing and evaluation has legal precedent due to the fact that certification of teachers is a prerogative of state government. In legal issues regarding testing, the United States Supreme Court voiced its position on employee testing as early as 1971. The Court found that the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VII, prevented an employer from rejecting black

applicants on the basis of a lack of completion of high school or on the results of a general intelligence test. (Griggs v. Duke, 1971). Later, lower courts invalidated the use of the GRE and NTE as violative of due process and equal protection because the examinations were not related to job performance. Since that time, however, governmental bodies and local school districts have been able to identify and justify examinations that more accurately measure performance.

In 1970, a suit was brought in a federal district court against South Carolina for the use of the NTE for both certification purposes and as a salary factor. For over thirty years the State of South Carolina and its agencies used scores on the NTE to make decisions with respect to the certification of teachers and the amount of state aid payable to local school districts. Local, school boards in the state used the NTE in the selection and compensation of teachers. In 1977, the Supreme Court found that the use of the NTE did not violate the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Title VII, USC Sec. 2000e (United States v. State of South Carolina, 1977). In viewing this case, the Court perceived that the state met the "rational relationship" standard. Essentially, the Court held that the Fourteenth Amendment permits the states a wide scope of discretion in enacting laws which affect some groups and citizens differently than others, provided the classification rests on grounds which are relevant to the

the state's objectives (McGowen v. Maryland, 1961). The Court found that the state had established some relationship between the examination and the competence of classroom teachers.

A recent case in California reinforces the authority of a local board to dismiss teachers for not passing a licensure examination (Unified Teachers-Los Angeles v. Los Angeles School District, 1983). Following the 1979-80 school year, eight probationary teachers were dismissed as employees of the district, for failing an examination in social studies formulated by the district. The state's appeals court upheld the school district, expressing its view that the school district did have a legitimate right to require teachers to pass such a test in order to insure some minimum standard of knowledge of teachers to teach various subjects.

Thus, with a strong legal base for state action, and public outcry for educational reform, legislation which mandates competency testing of preservice teachers has been introduced in most of the fifty states. The increased attention on teacher testing and the recent concern over a perceived lack of competence of teachers has also introduced the concepts of teacher induction, career ladders and performance appraisal. A steadily growing public perception is that certification testing, teacher induction, and career ladders are the answers to many of the woes voiced by taxpayers, parents, local school boards, and

state legislatures. Like reform movements of the past, the recently adopted legislated changes have largely been a response to public sentiment. For educational planners, the message is pointed: establish a proactive response to public and/or professional concerns or expect a reactive response from an elected or bureaucratic organization. In state after state, the Caesar crossing the Rubicon is an individual from the private sector, as in Texas, or an individual from the state's political environment.

Texas Educational Reform

Although the seeds for educational reform were planted in 1981 when Texas legislated minimum competency testing for preservice teachers, the widespread pressure for educational reform reached crisis proportions in the Spring of 1983 when the study A Nation at Risk was released and the results of the Houston ISD teacher examination were circulated. The ramifications were immediate and far reaching. The Texas Legislature passed a bill authorizing a select committee to study public education in Texas and report back to the legislature. Governor Mark White appointed the committee and named H. Ross Perot as chairman. Although the committee was made up of members from the House, Senate, State Board of Education, universities, public schools, state elected officials, and the public at large, it was organized and controlled by Mr. Perot, one of Texas' wealthiest citizens. The Committee met and studied public education in Texas for

six months. The final report of the so-called "Perot Commission" was accepted by the House of Representatives. As a result of this recommendation, the House and Senate passed HB 72 in November 1985, a comprehensive education bill which significantly modified the Texas Education Code.

Backed by the resources of millions of dollars and supported by personal and political clout, Mr. Perot had three major objectives for the reform of education in Texas: (1) restructure the State Board of Education and extend the influence of the Texas Education Agency, (2) revise the instructional program and curricular offerings of Texas schools, and (3) enact a comprehensive plan for the certification (and recertification) of teachers/administrators and establish a career ladder assignment based upon a statewide evaluation procedure. HB 72 also includes reform measures in school finance, transportation, curriculum and special programs, student rights and responsibilities, role and scope of teachers and administrators and most significantly, a comprehensive plan for career advancement and mandated performance appraisal. Unlike previous attempts at educational reform, HB 72 included provisions for funding.

Initially, the issue which received the most attention by the media was Texas Education Code, Section 21.290 which became nationally known as "no pass-no play." This section of the Texas Education code had a major impact on high school football but was inconsequential in its overall

impact on public education in Texas. Ironically, the most significant part of the legislation, TEC, Section 13.301, the career ladder, received relatively little attention by the press yet mandated a competency test for 240,000 Texas educators in the Summer of 1986 and authorized a uniform performance appraisal process for all teachers in the Fall of 1986.

Thus, one private citizen was largely responsible for planning a comprehensive educational reform package which was approved by the legislature and signed by the governor. Such planning was conducted in less than one year and was legislated with relatively little input from professional educators. HB 72 is significant as one model for educational change -- a legislative mandate which transforms some of the concerns for reform into a strategic plan of action.

The Texas Mandate

The Texas mandate exemplifies the dualistic nature of the educational enterprise. First, the mandate focuses on learners, outlining a process to assure that mastery learning takes place, and then centers on teachers, outlining a process to assure that mastery teaching takes place. The expectation that mastery learning and mastery teaching will be achieved under the Texas plan may be more assumption than realilty. Such an assumption, however, does not understate the enormous task achieved in the planning

for an improved Texas education system. The plan for the performance appraisal of teachers and for incentives to encourage improved performance is systematically outlined as part of the holistic approach to reform outlined in HB 72.

According to the plan, teachers are assigned to a career level based on these criteria which require an objective checking system: experience, job-related education advanced academic training, and job assignment. One other criteria, performance appraisal, requires an in class observation by a trained evaluator. Through a prescribed procedure, the quality of every teacher's performance must be evaluated in order to determine if the teacher belongs at career ladder Level 2, or 3, or 4. A major incentive for career ladder incentives is financial: a $2,000 higher salary at Level 2; a $4,000 higher salary at Level 3; and a $6,000 higher salary at Level 4.

The mastery learning system designed for students provides a criterion based evaluation system--all who reach stated learning goals reap the rewards of grades, promotions and certificates. The performance appraisal system designed for teachers to encourage mastery teaching and uses a normative evaluation system -- a plan similar to grading on the curve. Designed as an ideal, the plan also accommodates financial realities. If the allotment designated for support of the career ladder does not fully fund the supplements, the supplements may be reduced to not less

than $1,500, $3,000 and $4,500. The amount of dollars spent, of course, depends on the number of teachers who "exceed expectations" or who perform in a "clearly outstanding" manner. If too many teachers seriously attempt to become outstanding, and, if as a result, too many teachers are entitled to the supplement, another way to reduce the amount of money to be spent for quality teaching is to "provide for stricter performance criteria than that provided under Section 13.032 of this code, subject to the approval of the State Board of Education."

Who then will determine whether the performance of a teacher is satisfactory or outstanding and by what criteria? The appraisal process adopted by the State Board of Education, with advice from teachers, provides for an appraisal process using not fewer than two appraisers. One appraiser is to be the teacher's supervisor, the second an approved observer, perhaps a classroom teacher. The classroom teacher is not expected to teach at the same school campus as the teacher to be appraised but sometimes that rule will yield due to the fact that "it is impractical because of the number of campuses." These two appraisers are provided with "a uniform training program" and a set of "uniform certification standards." The appraisers using the state established standards (or a stricter version of the standards if financial necessity so requires and the State Board approves) place the performances of all teachers in

one of the following five categories:

(1) unsatisfactory (if the teacher's performance is clearly not acceptable in some major area);

(2) below expectations (if the teacher's performance needs improvement in some major areas);

(3) satisfactory (if the teacher's performance meets expectations);

(4) exceeding expectations (if the teacher's performance excels in some major areas);

(5) clearly outstanding.

Texas Education Code, Section 13.304

Teachers are guaranteed a conference with the appraisers and the conference is to be "diagnostic and prescriptive with regard to remediation as needed in overall summary of performance by category" and is to "identify the required performance for advancement to the next level."

A Level One teacher must hold a level one certificate and achieve at least satisfactory performance. A Level Two teacher has two years of experience and 15 hours of advanced training. In addition to additional experience and education, a Level Three teacher must have "at least performance exceeding expectations during three of the preceding four years and at least satisfactory performance during the other year or clearly outstanding performance during two of the preceding three years and at least satisfactory performance during the other year." To enter Level Four, a teacher must hold a master teacher certificate, based on successful performance on the master

teacher examination and, must have "clearly outstanding performance during two of the preceding three years and at least satisfactory performance during the other year or clearly outstanding performance during three consecutive years."

Steps taken on the career ladder can be downward as well as upward. To remain at level four, a teacher must have "clearly outstanding performance during two of every three years and at least satisfactory performance during the other year. A teacher shall be reassigned from career ladder level three to career ladder level two if the teacher has not better than satisfactory performance at level three for two consecutive years. . . .a teacher shall be reassigned from career ladder levels three or two, as applicable, and to career ladder level one if the teacher's performance is below expectations."

The Texas Appraisal Instrument outlines fourteen criteria under five domains: Instructional Strategies, Classroom Management and Organization, Presentation of Subject Matter, Learning Environment and Growth and Responsibilities. Each criterion includes a specific list of which indicate that the criterion has been met. The task of the appraiser is to record whether or not the necessary behavior has been exhibited in the classroom. This is done by simply marking that the behavior has been observed. In addition to the mark, below standard behavior or behavior of exceptional quality must be documented by specific exam-

ples in a space provided. The evaluation of the teacher's supervisor counts for 60% of the teacher's evaluation score and the second appraiser's conclusions weigh as 40% of the evaluation score.

Missouri Career Ladder Plan

Just as the Texas appraisal must be "diagnostic and prescriptive," the Performance Based Teacher Evaluation system in Missouri is to "be used for the improvement of quality classroom instruction and student achievement." A statute requiring Missouri school districts to implement a performance based teacher evaluation program was adopted by the Missouri Legislature in 1983. The law states that "each school district shall cause a comprehensive performance-based evaluation for each teacher employed by the district. Such evaluation shall be ongoing and of sufficient specificity and frequency to provide for demonstrated standards of competency and academic ability." (Section 168.128)

A 24-member committee charged with developing suggested procedures for performance based teacher evaluation defined performance based teacher evaluation as built upon "job-related criteria that are formulated from known factors about effective school teaching behavior," "Ideas," they stated, "about effective teaching developed by researchers such as Madeline Hunter also were an important resource for the development of" their guide. The committee was made up

of principals, recommended by the Elementary Principals' Association and of the Secondary Principals' Association; teachers, recommended by the Missouri State Teachers Association, the Missouri National Education Association and the Missouri Federation of Teachers; MNEA, MSTA and AFT repretives from the Board of Education; Superintendent; two legislators; and one representative from higher education: Dr. George Hyram, Executive Vice-President of Harris-Stowe State College, St. Louis. Also Dr. Jerry Valentine, Professor of Educational Administration UMC College of Education served as a special resource person for the Committee.

The Committee selected four general performance areas as the basis for the Missouri evaluation system:

(1) Instructional Process

(2) Classroom Management

(3) Interpersonal Relationships

(4) Professional Responsibilities

They then determined ten specific, research-based criteria, which serve as the foundation for the evaluation process. They provided descriptors for each of the criteria to answer the question: "What does the item (performance criterion) really mean?"

The Missouri evaluation process consists of a formative evaluation phase and a summative evaluation phase. The first phase is for the purpose of identifying teaching strengths and weaknesses and designating job targets. The

informative evaluation phase is to include both scheduled and unscheduled classroom observations; all observations are designed "to help teachers improve their performance by providing feedback and suggestions regarding their teaching skills." The Summative evaluation aids principals in carrying out their responsibility for classroom supervision and evaluation. The Summative phase is a "composite of information obtained through the formative observations and may serve as the basis for administrative decision making." Summative evaluations are to be completed for a probationary teacher each year and for tenured teachers at least once every three years or "as necessary to best serve the instructional process." The model is intended to assist schools "in meeting their statutory obligation." But school districts are permitted the freedom to adopt, modify or expand the assessment process.

"The role of the evaluator is to take notes during the observation and interpret those notes on the formative observation form." A pre-observation worksheet and post-observation conference follow the clinical supervision model which was advocated in the late 60's by Goldhammer and Cogan--a model more recently brought to the attention of a growing number of school administrators by the work of Madeline Hunter. The Missouri Formative Observation Form outlines an Instructional Process which is a direct borrowing from the Hunter or U.C.L.A. Model:

a. Establishes set.

b. States objectives.

c. Provides input.

d. Models ideal behavior.

e. Checks for comprehension.

f. Provides guided practice.

g. Provides independent practice.

h. Achieves closure.

The Missouri Model follows more closely the clinical supervisor model; the Texas Model follows the Teacher Performance Evaluation Process. In clinical supervision, the objective is to observe teacher performance and collect data using a script taping format and then to analyze the data considering principles of saliency, fewness, and treatability. The criteria for evaluation is established by the analyses. Subsequent evaluations are to compare performance 1 with performance 2 with performance 3; the goal is teacher improvement. Teacher Performance Evaluation, like that in Texas, requires that an observer be familiar with rating scales with criteria based upon effective teaching research. Rating scales permit observers to compare teachers to standards, to compare the performance of teacher A to that of teacher B, and to compare personal standards for teacher performance with local and national norms.

To educators, which observer model to use is a matter of high import. Madeline Hunter, for example, is rumored to have threatened suit if Texas used her name in connection

with their assessment process. She is a strong advocate of clinical supervision and is very outspoken in stating that anyone who goes into a classroom with a checklist in hand doesn't know what teaching is all about. Missouri and Texas school administrators have been among educators trained at U.C.L.A. under Hunter. Her book Mastery Teaching includes her seven step model, which she insists is a planning model --never intended as an evaluation model. Classroom evaluators, however, search for straight forward solutions to classroom problems. The 7-Step Model they contend provides such a solution. Hunter's 7-Step Model, easily understood, was adopted as an evaluation plan for Missouri, Texas, and numerous other states. Thus, Madeline Hunter, an unlikely military strategist, became the tactical leader in the march across the Rubicon.

Educational Reform and Educational Research

If, as in Texas and Missouri, the need for educational reform is being approached by observing teacher behavior as a step toward diagnosing and reforming that behavior when appropriate, and, if the observation plans are based on educational research, then one might ask two questions: 1) where are educational researchers or those involved in research institutions when these reform activities are taking place at the state level, and 2) are teachers being prepared to meet the standards against which they will be evaluated following training?

A Report of the Holmes Group: Tomorrow's Teachers (1986) provides possible answers to these questions. The report is prefaced with the statement that "a growing number of analysts are now urging higher education leaders to get into the thick of reform activities. . ." The Holmes Group "began with the modest goal of finding ways they could improve teacher education programs in universities such as their own--that is, those with research productivity as a central responsibility of the institution." The preface continues that a "flurry of concern swirled about their discussions" but "in spite of the controversy, the deans forged ahead. They needed to provide direction in their own institutions and states, for teaching and teacher education remain troubled fields." The Holmes Group began in 1983. "Originally the deans hoped they would be able to develop new, higher standards for teacher education at their institutions across a fifteen-month period. But as their study and deliberations progressed, the unrealistic nature of the original time frame became apparent." They found their task so complex that "the development of sound examinations to better screen individuals entering teaching would take three to five years..." More than a hundred research universities now have been invited to join the initial Holmes Group. During the years of "study and consensus-building" the group agreed that teachers have been "singled out as the one best hope for reform." They also agreed that teachers must be improved but that "plans for improving teaching also must be

improved."

To examine the goals of the Holmes Group is to understand the difference between deliberation (at the institutional level) and action (at the state level):

1. To make the education of teachers intellectually more solid. Teachers must have a greater command of academic subjects, and of the skills to teach them. They also need to become more thoughtful students of teaching, and its improvement.

2. To recognize differences in teachers' knowledge, skill, and commitment, in their education, certification, and work. If teachers are to become more effective professionals, we must distinguish between novices, competent members of the profession, and high-level professional leaders.

3. To create standards of entry to the profession--examinations and educational requirements--that are professionally relevant and intellectually defensible. American cannot afford any more teachers who fail a twelfth grade competency test. Neither can we afford to let people into teaching just because they have passed such simple, and often simpleminded exams.

4. To connect our own institutions to schools. If university faculties are to become more expert educators of teachers, they must make better use of expert teachers in the education of other teachers, and in research on teaching. In addition, schools must become places where both teachers and university faculty can systematically inquire into practice and improve it.

5. To make schools better places for teachers to work, and to learn. This will require less bureaucracy, more professional autonomy, and more leadership for teachers. But schools where teachers can learn from each other, and from other professionals, will be schools where good teachers will want to work. They also will be schools in which students will learn more.

Conclusions

To examine reform activities at the state level is to be convinced that universities have delayed too long to be

more than followers in plans for reform well underway; too late the decision that: "We have become convinced that university officials and professors must join with schools, and with the teacher organizations and state and local school government that shape the schools, to change the teaching profession." In a discussion of credentials and regulations, the group concludes: "Endorsing professional education does not imply that real performance evaluations will not be made, or that the credentials available through the educational programs will be accepted in lieu of on-the-job assessments of teaching ability. The issue is how to prepare the pool of teachers who are to be allowed to be evaluated. The problem is how to prepare the pool of teachers who will earn the highest assessments for their instructional effectiveness." Preparing the pool of teachers will be strongly influenced by assessment systems in place within each state--a reactive rather than proactive stance.

University-based educators may deliberate longer on elements of reform, such as the assessment and improvement of teachers, because they see more clearly the complexities of possible solution to problems. This awareness slows action; researchers may value the deliberations more than the action. But the signs are clear and abundant. The Governor's 1991 Report on Education strongly states that if American higher education does not act, the government will. The Carnegie report, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for

the 21st Century, states that "virtually every occupation regarded by the public as a true profession has codified the knowledge, the specific expertise, required by its practitioners, and has required that those who wish to practice that profession with the sanction of its members demonstrate that they have a command of the needed knowledge and the ability to apply it. That is, the leading members of the profession decide what professionals in that area need to know and be able to do. They capture that knowledge in an assessment or examination and administer that examination to people who want a certificate saying they passed the assessment."

Ironically, teachers may be on the job before they are measured against what they "need to know and be able to do" in specific terms.

National Trends

Following the wave of interest in raising and maintaining high standards in teaching not only in Texas but across the country, there has been a rush to develop performance appraisal systems and instruments. In 1983 no state had a performance based incentive plan for teachers and administrators and there was only passing interest in one or two states in considering such reform. By 1985, 14 states had enacted plans for implementation or pilot testing, 8 states had either legislative or state board mandates to develop plans, and 15 other states were consider-

ing incentive plans for teachers and administrators (Cornett, 1985).

With the development of incentive structures such as career ladders and career development plans, performance evaluation has consistently been a consideration. The structure of the plan in most instances is the easier element to develop over the evaluation system (Cornett, 1985). The structure of the plan relates to eligibility, the outline of the career ladder or career path, procedures for moving from one level to the next, types of incentives, duties of teachers at appropriate levels, the responsibility of the local district, requirements for staff development as well as a number of other considerations. In the case of Alabama, Kentucky, Missouri, New Mexico, North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Utah, career ladders are mandated statewide. (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1986). In other states, such as Arizona and Colorado, individual school districts may be developing their own system either as a pilot project for the state, or through the individual initiative of the district itself.

The Charlotte-Mecklenberg Teacher Career Development Program in North Carolina represents an example of the initiative of an individual school district to develop teacher evaluations and career ladders. (Cornett, 1986). In that district, all new teachers are required to be a part of the program and veteran teachers may voluntarily join.

At the present time, 9 states have mandated induction programs, 8 states have career ladder requirements, and 9 states have mandated performance appraisal of teachers. (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1986). A host of other states have as wide a variety in design as they do in number and the progress toward implementation depends upon not only the direction from which the initiative comes and the agency involved, but it also depends upon the degree of public concern and the availability of funding.

Some state legislatures have a plan before them, but are unwilling or unable to provide the funding. Examples of that dilemma occurred in Montana and Nebraska (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1986). In other states, the governor or statewide commissions have proposed changes which are now being considered. State departments of education or state boards of education have also been involved in the process and have initiated changes in some cases.

It would be presumptous at any given time to attempt to establish the exact position of every state on the issues of induction, career ladders, and mandated performance appraisal because in some states these issues are in a constant stage of change. Astuto and Clark (1986) established the following stages of policy development.

(1) adoption, i.e., a policy has been chosen and passed through the legislative process;

Figure I

STATES WITH MANDATED PROGRAMS

Induction	Career Ladder	Mandated Performance Appraisal
Washington, D.C.	Alabama	Colorado
Florida	Kentucky	Florida
Kentucky	Missouri	Illinois
Mississippi	New Mexico	Virginia
North Carolina	North Carolina	Alabama
Oklahoma	Tennessee	Mississippi
South Dakota	Texas	New Mexico
Utah	Utah	South Carolina
Virginia		Texas
		Missouri

Figure 2

EXAMPLES OF STATES WHERE PLANS ARE UNDER CONSIDERATION

Connecticut
(recommended by Governor's Commission)

Louisiana
(being developed)

Maryland
(being developed)

Massachusetts
(partial)

Missouri
(starting in 1988)

New Mexico
(for administrators)

Arizona
(pilot projects)

Connecticut
(recommended by Governor's Commission)

Delaware
(recommended by Governor's Commission)

Georgia
(recommended by Governor's Commission)

Idaho
(being developed)

Connecticut
(recommended by Governor's Commission)

Delaware
(recommended by Governor's Commission)

Louisiana
(being developed)

(2) trail, i.e., the policy has received approval for experimentationn either thorough the legislative process or by executive action;

(3) deliberation, i.e., a policy has been introduced in the legislative process and is under consideration or undergoing refinement;

(4) development, i.e., task forces or subcommittees have been formed and charged with the responsibility of drafting a policy for consideration or making policy recommendations;

(5) proposition, i.e., a particular policy direction has been proposed for discussion and possible consideration.

Figure 3 indicates the stages of policy development as defined by Astuto and Clark for those states active in the process in 1985 (Astuto and Clark, 1986).

Some examples of the types of evaluation systems currently being required or under consideration may be worth mentioning to demonstrate the variation of actions from state to state. In Colorado where statewide performance evaluation of teachers is mandated, LEAs are required to design their own evaluation instruments following state guidelines. After September 1, 1988, recertification of all teachers will be tied to the evaluation instruments administered.

In Florida where performance evaluation is also required, each teacher is evaluated by the principal using a state approved evaluation system. On the other hand, in Illinois, LEAs develop in cooperation with teachers and/or teacher organizations a plan requiring evaluation to occur every two years. The Illinois model also provides for a

description of duties and responsibilities to be issued to each teacher who will be evaluated against those duties and responsibilities. Administrators in that state will have their performance assessed by independent evaluators. Illinois also requires that teacher evaluators be "adequately trained" and that performance scales and ratings must be used. Teachers failing to acquire a satisfactory rating after a remedial period must under Illinois law be dismissed.

In Mississippi a mandatory assessment of experienced teachers will be initiated during the 1986-87 school year to determine eligibility for a $1,000 pay raise for the following year. A further twist to the system was developed in New Mexico where the state legislature in 1986 eliminated the state's teacher tenure system. LEAs will be given responsibility to enforce a state developed competency evaluation for certificate renewal. It is interesting to note, however, that the new law guarantees that certified instructors will not be required to perform noninstructional duties.

Numerous other examples could be cited of current activity in the development of performance appraisal practices; however, there seems to be a consistent belief among the state legislatures involved in developing performance mandates: 1) that performance appraisal of public personnel is indeed possible and necessary, and 2) that

it is the responsibility of the state governing body to make certain that it happens.

Discussion

Since 1983, across the nation, states have initiated activities and launched plans to raise educational standards at every level. Responding to the Commission on Excellence, states have reviewed and revised curriculur requirements for elementary, middle, and secondary students. Measures to assure mastery learning are now required in many states. To assure mastery teaching, higher education has responded by raising the entrance and exit requirements for teacher education majors at most institutions. The states have answered by increasing the standards for certification and recertification.

Some states, such as Texas, have reacted to the cry for reform by enacting a comprehensive reformation of education. HB 72, going beyond many other states, has implemented a comprehensive "career ladder" model for the testing, certification, placement, and evaluation of all teachers in the state. The reform movement in Texas is likely to have a profound effect on other states and, potentially, educators at every level. The concept of a career ladder has three major components: competency testing, merit pay, and performance appraisal. The promise of HB 72 is that teachers will demonstrate a knowledge of basic skills, a knowledge of subject matter, and a knowledge of pedagogy.

It is anticipated that such a plan will lead educators to a heightened level of professionalism.

The actions of Texas represent only one model. Plans vary dramatically from state to state as each attempts to define its own priorities and its own future. An analysis of such reform efforts leads to the conclusion that state planners are determining the future of education. The planners may be legislators, governors, educators, or public citizens depending on the locale. It is anticipated that as planners examine various models, they will design an educational plan which is predicated on research and will implement a design which brings educators closer to the optimum. Indeed, the Rubicon has been crossed; the challenge that lies ahead must be confronted.

References

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Teacher Education in the States: 50-State Survey of Legislative and Administrative Actions, Washington, D.C., 1986.

Astuto, T. A. and Clark, D. L., Merit Pay For Teachers: An Analysis of State Policy Options, Manhattan: Kansas State University, College of Education; Topeka: Kansas State Department of Education.

Cogan, M. L., Clinical Supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Goldhammer, R., Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Griggs v. Duke Power Company, 401 US 424 (1971).

Kidd, Jim L., "Where Have All the Teachers Gone?" A.T.P.E. News, March 1984.

Mallory, Arthur L., et al, Guidelines for Performance Based Based Teacher Evaluation in Missouri, Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education, Jefferson City, MO, June 1984.

McGowen v. Maryland, 366 US 420 (1961).

Peck, Harry T., (ed.). Harper's Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities, New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1965.

Solorazano, Lucia, "What's Wrong With Our Teachers?" U. S. News & World Report, U. S. News & World Report, Inc., Washington, D.C., March 14, 1986.

Southern Regional Education Board, Implementing Plans: Success and Change, Atlanta, GA, March 1986.

Southern Regional Education Board, Planning Career Ladders: Lessons From the States, Atlanta, GA, March 1986.

Stinnett, T.M. and Huggett, Albert J., Professional Problems of Teachers, 2nd ed., Macmillan, 1963 in Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Robert Evel (ed) Macmillan, 1969.

Texas Education Agency, HB 72 and Subsequent Educational Legislation: Austin: TEA, November 1985.

United Teachers, Los Angeles v. Los Angeles Unified School District, 189 Cal. Reporter 897, (app. 1983).

United States v. South Carolina, 445 F. Supp. 1094, affd 434 US 1026 (1977).

Washington v. Davis, 426 US 229 (1976).

Williams, Dennis, et. al. "Can the Schools be Saved? "Newsweek, May 9, 1983, Newsweek, Inc., New York: New York.

Figure 3

STAGES IN THE POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Adoption	Trial	Deliberation	Development	Proposition
Arizona	Colorado	Connecticut	Alabama	Alaska
California	Maine	Georgia	Delaware	Mississippi
Florida	New Jersey	Idano	Kentucky	New Hampshire
Maryland	Virginia	Massachusetts	Louisiana	
Pennsylvania	Wisconsin	North Carolina	Nebraska	
Tennessee	South Carolina		Oregon	
Texas			Vermont	
Utah			Washington	